UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,200	05/15/2000	YASUHARU ASANO	3712174-00779	3922

29175   7590   12/02/2009

K&L Gates LLP
P. O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690

EXAMINER
SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 May 2009_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,4,7-24,27,30-32 and 34-41_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,4,7-24,27,30-32 and 34-41_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _12 October 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1.   This office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed

5/26/09. Claims 1, 4, 7-24, 27, 30-32, and 34-41 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 5/26/09, with respect to

claims 27, 30-32, 36, 37 and 39 have been fully considered and are

persuasive. The 35 USC 101 rejections of the above claims have been

withdrawn.

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/26/09, as discussed below, have been

fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 4, 7-24, 27 and 30-32, rejected under 35 USC

102 (b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,652,896 to Yamauchi,

applicant argues, "First, Yamauchi's editing of the selected source-

language sentence, as relied upon by the .Examiner to teach re-converting

does not change the pattern of the source-language sentence or the word

order of the source-language sentence. See Office Action, page 8, lines 3-

8. "[A] representing pattern corresponding to the selected source-language

sentence is decided." Yamauchi, column 50, lines 45-47. Thus, regardless

of the editing process, the same pattern for the source-language sentence

will be used for translation. In other words, Yamauchi's editing process

does not switch the pattern of the selected source-language sentence from

"(<Pattern>) (Itestl <SOMETHING>)" to "(<AltPat><SOMETHING> lbe

testedl)" or between the patterns in Fig. 74. Rather than changing the word

order of the source-language sentence, the editing process merely

changes a word in the selected-source sentence. Yamauchi discloses "a

word changed in the editing process is detected." Yamauchi, column 49,

lines 42-43 (emphasis added). For example, "'koisha" is changed to

"karera'" in the editing process. See Yamauchi, column 50, lines 50-55."

The examiner cannot concur with the applicant's arguments, where

the applicant has included an "editing" embodiment towards the patterns,

see applicant's above arguments regarding Yamauchi, column 49 lines 42-

43, which discuss word changes (see heading for that embodiment "Editing

in the source language sentence"). It is explicitly illustrated in Fig. 74, the

word order of the source language, (not changed words, as it is an

alternate pattern citation, not alternate/edited words), have been alternated,

the positioning changed. Furthermore, Yamauchi, in describing Fig. 74,

(C.39 lines 25-33) explicitly teach the source language to correspond to

information in a target language. Thus applicant's arguments that the

alternate patterns of Fig. 42 only apply to the target language are

unpersuasive.

Regarding applicant's arguments to claims 38 and 39, applicant

argues, "Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,505 to

Fushimoto ('Fushimoto"). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the

rejections for at least the reasons set forth below. First, Applicants submit

that, at a minimum, the cited prior art, even if properly combinable, fails to

teach "each of the plurality of representations of the second natural

language has a one-to-one correspondence with a representation of a third

natural language" as claimed in Claims 38 and 39. The Examiner

recognizes that Yamauchi fails to teach this element and instead relies on

Fushimoto's French to English representations in Fig. 8. See Office Action,

page 23, lines 5-8. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that one

French word corresponds to multiple English words. For example, the

French word "trouver'" corresponds to the English words "find," detect,"

"deem, ... discover," and "judge." Fushimoto, Fig. 8. Similarly, the German

word "finden" corresponds to the English words "find" and "discover;" and

the English word "find" corresponds to the French words "trouver" and

"estimer." Fushimoto, Fig. 8.

The Examiner cannot concur with the applicant's arguments, wherein

Fushimoto is explicitly concerned with the disambiguation of the particular

word in question, and selects the word that has the one to one

correspondence, (see Fig. 8, Fig. 10, and C.7 lines 1-17, wherein finden,

has the one to one correspondence with "find" in English, which has a one

to one correspondence with "trouver" in French. This is evident due to the

disambiguation process which involves the possible translations, however,

the one to one correspondence method removes, "estimer" and all other

non one to one correspondent words. Therefore, the applicant's arguments

are unpersuasive. Furthermore, the Examiner notes the inadvertent

limitation incorporated from canceled claim 33 with Fushimoto. The

Yamauchi with Fushimoto references as prior art remains the same as the

correction is made. The "processing means for translating the at least one

representation of the second natural language to the third natural

language" remains the same as seen in the previous rejection as being

taught by Fushimoto and combined with Yamauchi. Therefore, applicant's

arguments remain unpersuasive with respect to the obviousness rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in

this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claim 1, 4, 7-24, 27, 30-32, and 34-37 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamauchi et al. (US 5,652,896).

As per **claims 1 and 27**, Yamauchi et al. discloses an apparatus

comprising:

input means for inputting a first natural language (C.10.lines 30-32);

converting means for converting the first natural language inputted by

the input means into a plurality of representations within the same first

natural language (Fig. 88-his cursor in a menu box containing a plurality of

converted representations in the same natural language of a first natural

language input, C.19-C.20-his plurality of representations in his source

language, Japanese, C.50 lines 34-45-his plurality of representations in the

source language as intermediate structures (S), instead of target language

patterns generated from source language, C.10.line 53, C.11.line 48-55-

intermediate structure), the plurality of representations replacing

postpositional words of the first natural language (ibid, Fig. 73, 74, Fig. 88,

the Examiner notes, postpositional phrases/words, all are included first

natural language, and are replaced in order to develop his plurality of

representations in the first natural language, C.20 lines 13-62-describe

alternate words replacing postpositional words, and having "sem" left over

in a pattern, functioning as an auxiliary, however, does not teach having a

source language that precludes postpositional phrases from being replaced

by another representation, furthermore the entire source language

sentence is processed, including postpositional phrases, C.20 lines 61-67,

and may be replaced, C.21 lines 18-25-his "sem"/postpositional word and

further word creation to the structure);

confirmation means for confirming at least one representation

converted by the converting means as being closest in meaning to the

inputted first natural language (Fig. 88 his cursor providing confirmation

means for closest in meaning of one of a plurality of representations of an

input, C.50 lines 45-47-his selection as the intended/inherent closest in

meaning, C.13.lines 44-50-generations of the intermediate structure (S)

from the source input, C.38.lines 27-29);

re-converting means for re-converting the confirmed at least one

representation to a re-converted representation within the same first natural

language (C.50 lines 24-49, his plurality of source language sentences

generated and one selected, thus confirmed, there is a re-conversion, and

edit to the source sentence, C.50 lines 45-55-re-converted source

language sentence through the positioning and editing of the converted

source language sentence) by exchanging word order of the at least one

representation (C.39, lines 25-33, Yamauchi teaches "The structure of a

sentence depends on the target-language, and **information in the source-

language is made so as to correspond to the information in the target-

language (see FIG. 74)**). The information is stored in the request

information buffer. In a case of the system which is not interactive, the

default value is substituted for the information which is not extracted from

the intermediate structure, and the process is then completed." Fig. 42-44

illustrate his alternative pattern, which contain a re-converted

representation, wherein the representation is converted to a re-converted

representation by exchanging word order of the at least one representation,

his **"(<Pattern>) (|test| <SOMETHING>)" and his "(<AltPat>

(<SOMETHING> |be tested|)**, each pattern within the Fig. 42 comprises a

re-converted pattern, wherein the word order is exchanged. In **Fig. 74** the word order is thus exchanged, between the different patterns, and thus the representation is thus exchanged);

processing means for translating the re-converted representation to a second natural language (C.50 lines 45-57, his translation of the re-converted sentence, and Figs. 75-79 and C.39 lines 40-49-his translation as the translation of the word order exchanged representations); and

output means for outputting the second natural language processed by the processing means (ibid, C.38.lines 55, 56-his display unit as per claim 27-output step...on a display section).

As per **claim 4**, Yamauchi et al discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 4 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the processing means carries out processing by template (Fig 28-the template-corresponding to processing means for translation).

As per **claim 7**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the converting means further converts the first natural language inputted by the input means into third language (C.38.lines 7-9-retranslation

is interpreted as a third language from a first language, C.37.lines 39-59, in

addition C.52.lines 35-38-Kana to Kanji to English conversion).

As per **claim 8**, Yamauchi et al discloses all of the limitations of claim

1, upon which claim 8 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the converting means converts plural representations into single

representation with respect to representation of natural language inputted

by the input means (C.14.lines 17-22).

As per **claim 9**, Yamauchi et al discloses all of the limitations of claim

1, upon which claim 9 depends. Yamauchi et al. further disclose:

the converting means converts polysemous representation into plural

univocal representations with respect to representation of natural language

inputted by the input means (C.14.lines 50-61).

As per **claim 10**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the converting means carries out conversion by at least one of

merger (integration), division, deletion, replacement and exchange of order

with respect to representation of natural language inputted by the input

means (C.21.lines 60-67, C.22.line 48-C.23.line 16-replacement and

deletion with respect to the source language is done with the reference

sentence with respect to the intermediate structure).

As per **claim 11**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 1, upon which claim 11 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the input means inputs natural language by speech (C.37.lines 42-

45).

As per **claim 12**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 11, upon which claim 12 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the confirmation means confirms, only once, natural language

inputted by speech to the input means (C.37.lines 42-45, C.38.lines 40-56).

As per **claim 13**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 1, upon which claim 13 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the input means inputs natural language character by character

(C.37.lines 42, 43-keyboard input).

As per **claim 14**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 13, upon which claim 14 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the confirmation means confirms, only once, natural language

inputted by character at the input means (C.37.lines 42, 43 C.38.lines 40-

56).

As per **claims 15**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 1, upon which claim 15 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the first natural language is inputted to the input means (see claim 1),

the converting means converts first language inputted via the input means

into a second representation of the second language and converts it into

first representation of the first language having one-to-one correspondence

with respect to the second representation, and the confirmation means

carries out confirmation by using the first representation (C.38.lines 24-35).

As per **claims 16 and 30**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the

limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. Yamauchi et al.

further discloses:

the processing means translates the first language into the second

language on the basis of conversion at the converting means and

confirmation at the confirmation means and the output means outputs the

second language translated by the processing means (C.38.lines 24-56).

As per **claim 17 and 31**, Yamauchi et al. discloses a natural

language processing apparatus comprising:

input means for inputting natural language (C.15.lines 25-27,

C.37.lines 39, 40);

a plurality of processing means for implementing processing of the

natural language (C.10.lines 44-67, C.11.lines 48-55, C.37.lines 42-45,

speech input processing and analysis processing, Fig. 115 text editor

processing), at least one processing means configured to convert the first

natural language inputted into a plurality of representations of the natural

language (Fig. 88-his cursor pointed at the plurality of representations,

C.50 lines 34-45-his plurality of representations in the source language as

intermediate structures (S), instead of target language patterns generated

from source language)

a plurality of confirmation means for confirming result of processing

with respect to the natural language (Fig. 61-input confirmation in the edit

area, C.38.lines 25-30-input sentence structure), at least one confirmation

means configured to confirm at least one representation being closest in

meaning to the inputted first natural language (Fig. 88-his cursor to the

closest/intended meaning, C.50 lines 45-47 further confirmation means);

a plurality of reconverting means for re-converting the plurality of

confirmed representations into a plurality of re-converted representations of

the natural language (C.50 lines 24-49, his plurality of source language

sentences generated and edit to the source sentences and confirmation,

C.50 lines 45-55- produce his re-converted source language sentences

through the positioning and editing of the converted source language

sentence) by exchanging word order within the plurality of representations

(C.39, lines 25-33, Yamauchi teaches "The structure of a sentence

depends on the target-language, and **information in the source-language**

is made so as to correspond to the information in the target-language

(see FIG. 74). The information is stored in the request information buffer. In

a case of the system which is not interactive, the default value is

substituted for the information which is not extracted from the intermediate

structure, and the process is then completed." Fig. 42-44 illustrate his

alternative pattern, which contain a re-converted representation, wherein

the representation is converted to a re-converted representation by

exchanging word order of the at least one representation, his **"(<Pattern>)**

(|test| <SOMETHING>)" and his "(<AltPat> (<SOMETHING> |be

tested|), each pattern within the Fig. 42 comprises a **re-converted** pattern,

wherein the word order is exchanged. In **Fig. 74** the word order is thus

exchanged, between the different patterns, and thus the representation is

thus exchanged); and

output means for outputting the processed natural language

(C.37.lines 55-59, C.50 lines 45-47),

wherein a second processing means for converting the natural

language and a second confirmation means for confirming result of the

second processing (C.38.lines 40-45-second processing including

information retrieval processing by natural language wherein the

confirmation is the user selection of a presented word-to-word translation,

C.38.lines 1-9, 16, 17, which includes retrieval processing by the natural

language input) means are provided at a stage preceding a first processing

means to thereby carry out execution in advance of confirmation of the first

processing means to delete confirmation of result of the first processing

means (Fig. 78-step 19, step 20, Fig. 79 steps 25, 26...Yamakita provides

multiple confirmation means, however, in advance of his step 26, contains

an operation to delete confirmation-his deletion by selecting "Y" which

makes null the previous confirmation/taken as deletion, and provides a

current confirmation translation).

As per **claim 18**, Yamauchi discloses all the limitations of claim 17,

upon which claim 18 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

processing by the first processing means is machine translation

processing, kana-kanji conversion processing, information retrieval

processing by natural language, or representation conversion processing

by natural language (C.38.lines 40-56- translating being the first processing

means, and the translation is displayed).

As per **claim 19**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 17, upon which claim 19 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

processing by the second processing means is machine translation

processing, kana-kanji conversion processing, information retrieval

processing by natural language, or representation conversion processing

by natural language (C.38.lines 40-45-second processing including

information retrieval processing by natural language wherein the

confirmation is the user selection of a presented word-for-word translation

of natural, C.38.lines 1-9, 16, 17, which includes retrieval processing by the

natural language input).

As per **claim 20 and 32**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the

limitations of claim 17, upon which claim 20 depends. Yamauchi et al.

further discloses:

at a stage preceding the second processing means (the speech or

OCR input necessarily precedes the above cited second processing

means), a third processing means and third confirmation means for

confirming result thereof (speech input or OCR input and confirmation

thereof in the input Edit section, C.37.lines 39-44, Fig 61 "Editing",

"Japanese", "original"), wherein the third confirmation means is coupled to

the portion after the second or subsequent processing means, or wherein

the third confirmation means is merged or integrated into the second

confirmation means or confirmation means of the stage succeeding thereto

to carry out postponement of confirmation (C.37.lines 39-55, Fig. 65 items

21, 26, Fig 85 items 62, 66, the speech or OCR input and confirmation

means are coupled to the information retrieval from the information

recording unit which contains a plurality of information databases, which

inherently provides, until the input is confirmed-the process of receiving the

input by speech and confirming by selection of the input to be implemented

in another process, postponement of the machine translation is carried

out).

As per **claim 21**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 20, upon which claim 21 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the second confirmation and the third confirmation means are merged

or integrated gives result of processing as numeric value to present the

numeric value (C.19.lines 49-57-the recognized and confirmed words

inputted and confirmed integrated identified processed natural language for

retrieval, have calculated scores).

As per **claim 22**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 20, upon which claim 22 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

the first processing means carries out machine translation (C.37.line

50)and the third processing means carries out speech recognition

(C.37.lines 44, 45).

As per **claim 23**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 20, upon which claim 23 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

speech recognition processing means for carrying out speech

recognition of natural language inputted to the input means (C.37.lines 43-

45), recognition result confirmation means for confirming recognition result

at the speech recognition processing means (C.51.line 63-C.52.line 15-

input editing means, wherein the input is confirmed by selection), machine

translation means for implementing machine translation to the result

confirmed at the recognition result confirmation means, (C.37.line 48), and

translation result confirmation means for confirming translation result at the

machine translation means (C.37.lines 55-59).

wherein representation conversion processing means for converting

representation and representation conversion confirming means for

confirming result of the conversion (C.10.lines 30-32, C.13.lines 44-50,

C.23.lines 26-59, C.32.line 59-C.33.line 6, C.38.lines 27-29) thereof are

supplemented at the preceding stage of the machine translation processing

(C.23.lines 41-59) means to thereby carry out execution in advance of

processing by the translation result confirmation means (C.23.lines 58, 59)

to omit the translation result confirming means of the stage succeeding to

the machine translation processing means (C.23.lines 58, 59, Fig. 28, Fig.

29-the translation confirming means has been omitted by the confirmation

of the original input sentence conversion means-the confirmed sentence is

translated without further confirmation, C.23.line 59, "the translation is

completed").

As per **claim 24**, Yamauchi et al. discloses all of the limitations of

claim 23, upon which claim 24 depends. Yamauchi et al. further discloses:

postponement of processing by the recognition result confirming

means which merges or integrates the recognition result confirmation result

with the representation conversion result confirming means existing at the

stage succeeding thereto is carried out (C.37.lines 39-55, Fig. 65 items 21,

26, Fig 85 items 62, 66, the speech input and confirmation means are

coupled to the information retrieval from the information recording unit

which contains a plurality of information databases, which inherently

provides, until the input is confirmed-the process of receiving the input by

speech and confirming by selection of the input to be implemented in

another process, postponement of the machine translation is carried out).

As per **claims 34 and 36**, Yamauchi teaches a natural language

processing apparatus as set forth in claim 1, wherein the re-converted

representation has the same meaning as the at least one representation

(Fig. 42-44 illustrate his alternative pattern, which contain a re-converted

representation, wherein the representation is converted to a re-converted

representation by exchanging word order of the at least one representation,

his **"(<Pattern>) (|test| <SOMETHING>)"** and his **"(<AltPat>**

(<SOMETHING> |be tested|), each pattern within the Fig. 42 comprises a

re-converted pattern, wherein the word order is exchanged. In **Fig. 74** the

word order is thus exchanged, between the different patterns, and thus the

representation is thus exchanged, yet the meaning remains the same).

As per **claims 35 and 37**, Yamauchi teaches a natural language

processing apparatus as set forth in claim 17, wherein the plurality of re-

converted representations have the same meaning as the plurality of

representations (Fig. 42-44 illustrate his alternative pattern, which contain a

re-converted representation, wherein the representation is converted to a

re-converted representation by exchanging word order of the at least one

representation, his **"(<Pattern>) (|test| <SOMETHING>)" and his**

"(<AltPat> (<SOMETHING> |be tested|), each pattern within the Fig. 42

comprises a **re-converted** pattern, wherein the word order is exchanged.

In **Fig. 74** the word order is thus exchanged, between the different patterns,

and thus the representation is thus exchanged, yet the meaning remains

the same).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the

basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Fushimoto (US 5,742,505).

As per **claims 38 and 39**, Yamauchi et al discloses a natural

language apparatus comprising:

input means for inputting a first natural language (C.15.lines 25-27,

C.37.lines 39, 40);

converting means for converting the first natural language into a

plurality of representations of a second natural language (Fig. 88-his menu

of items, C.50 lines 24-45-as his first natural language, and second natural

language)

confirmation means for confirming at least one representation of the

second natural language that is the closest in meaning to the first natural

language (Fig. 88-his cursor to the item representing the closest in

intended meaning, C.38.lines 24-35-confirmation of second translation, Fig.

67 items 31 and 34);

outputting on a display section (C.38 lines 55, 56-his translation on

his display unit)

Yamauchi lacks explicitly teaching wherein each of the plurality of

representations of the second natural language has a one-to-one

correspondence with a representation of a third natural language and the

third language being different from both the first and second languages,

and processing means for translating the at least one representation of the

second natural language to a third natural language; and outputting the

third natural language.

However, Fushimoto teaches a plurality of representations of the

second natural language has a one-to-one correspondence with a

representation of a third natural language (Fig. 8 his French to English

representations, see Fig. 8, Fig. 10, and C.7 lines 1-17, wherein finden, has

the one to one correspondence with "find" in English, which has a one to

one correspondence with "trouver" in French. This is evident due to the

disambiguation process which involves the possible translations, however,

the one to one correspondence method removes, "estimer" and all other

non one to one correspondent words) and the third language being

different from both the first and second language (C.7 lines 25-31-his

French, German and English), and processing means for translating the at

least one representation of the second natural language to a third natural

language; and outputting the third natural language (Fushimoto, C.7 lines

1-23-his translation and display of his third language). Therefore, at the

time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in

the art to modify Yamauchi's second language representation with a third

language representation, having a plurality of representations with one-to-one correspondence with a third language, the third language being different from both the first and second languages, providing the benefit of using an intermediate language to translate from a first language to a second, providing there is a better translation between the first and third language, wherein the third language can further be accurately translated and outputted in the desired language (Fushimoto, C.7 lines 1-23-as his chain translation including three languages and output).

8.   Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Fushimoto (US 5,742,505), as applied to claims 38 and 39 above, and further in view of Fushimoto (Fushimoto II, US 5,541,837).

As per **claims 40 and 41**, which depend on claims 38 and 39 respectively, Yamauchi and Fushimoto make obvious a natural language processing apparatus as set forth in claim 38, but lack wherein the at least one representation of the second natural language that is translated into the third natural language is at least one sentence. However, Fushimoto II teaches at least one representation of a second natural language that is translated into a third natural language is at least one sentence (C.8 lines

23-27-his application of his translation of words as it applies to sentences,

see abstract, his target language translation translated into the third

language).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

one ordinarily skilled in the art, to substitute the sentences of Fushimoto II

with Yamauchi and Fushimoto, thus providing a disambiguated translation

result in a desired target language (i.e. a third language one-to-one

correspondence translation).

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-       Flanagan et al. (US 5,966,685) teaches a one to one

        correspondence third language translation system.

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection

presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**

FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to

expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a

first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final

action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory

period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the

mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final

action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to LAMONT M. SPOONER whose

telephone number is 571-272-7613. The examiner can normally be

reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

      If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7602.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

lms
8/17/09